



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Theolog. Jahresbericht and Krüger's excellent *Geschichte der altchristl. Litteratur* (1895) and *Nachträge* (1897) are easily to be consulted. At times Schaff's original is so materially condensed in the German as to lose vital points. P. 77 (middle) Renesse says: "Giffert, ein Zuhörer von Schaff." Two mistakes. Schaff in 1889 writes (p. 97): "One of my students, Mr. Arthur C. McGiffert." Renesse in 1897 should have known that McGiffert is Schaff's successor in the Union Theological Seminary. Pp. 108-9 Renesse adds one paragraph on the teaching and the Sibylline oracles, not found in Schaff; it is compiled from Harris, but with omission of some of the important recent literature, *e. g.*, Rzach's edition of the Sibylline oracles, etc. The old unsatisfactory etymology of *Sibyl* is dished up again.¹ P. 80 no knowledge whatever is betrayed of Harnack's famous treatise on *De aleatoribus* in *Texte u. Untersuch.*, V, No. 1 (1888), nor of Iselin-Heusler, "Eine bisher unbekannte Version des ersten Teiles der 'Apostellehre,'" *ibid.*, XIII, No. 1 (1895). These are only a few errors and omissions that have come to our observation. No one that has Schaff's book will for a moment think of even consulting a book which on every page betrays that the author's knowledge is entirely "second hand," that aside from Schaff's compilation he knows no literature concerning the Teaching of the Apostles.

W. MUSS-ARNOLT.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS UND DAS NEUE TESTAMENT. Eine Untersuchung von LIC. THEOL. HERMANN KUTTER, Pfarrer in Vinelz (Schweiz). Giessen: J. Ricker'sche Buchhandlung, 1897. Pp. 152. M. 3.60.

THIS monograph is a careful investigation of the attitude of Clement of Alexandria to the New Testament. Such specific studies are of great value, since only by them can the basis be laid for a safe induction preparatory to a history of the canon. Especially does Clement need careful study since, by reason of his freedom of thought and critical carelessness on the one hand, and his loyalty to Catholi-

¹ Attention may be called here to the etymology just recently proposed by H. Lewy in the *Philologus*, Vol. 57, 350-51, who derives Σιβυλλα, or rather Σιβύλλα, from the Semitic (Aramean *sábá, sábtá*, "old woman, granny," the masc. form of which occurs in the Talmud with the meaning of "a man of learning, scholar") + the diminutive ending -ύλλα, the word thus meaning properly "little granny" (*Grossmütterchen*).

cism and tradition on the other, he appears to lend support to quite different opinions concerning the Bible of the early church. In this brief review we can do little more than summarize the conclusions to which our investigator has come.

Kutter takes his start fundamentally from Zahn's conclusions and also acknowledges his debt to his immediate predecessor, the Catholic critic P. Dausch (*Der neutestamentliche Schriftkanon und Clemens von Alexandrien*, 1894, I. Teil). He follows Zahn in admitting that Clement did not have our formal conception of a canon, but contends that it by no means follows that he did not make a clear distinction between Scripture and other books. He differs from Dausch in denying that Clement elevated the authority of ecclesiastical tradition to that of Scripture. His principal effort is to try to go behind the formal expressions about Scripture which Clement used and learn his whole mental attitude on the subject. In this he has certainly aimed at the right thing. Clement was often careless in his expressions, sometimes inconsistent with himself. He had his own peculiar notions, too, though at other times controlled by the belief of the church. We must study his whole way of dealing with the New Testament and judge his formal expressions in the light of it. Kutter, therefore, asks whether, in spite of Clement's arbitrariness in the use of Scripture, we cannot learn the real distinction which he made between Scripture and other books and the principle on which it was based.

Kutter notes at the outset that Clement was saturated with Scripture. Quotations from it fall from his pen in great numbers and with the freedom of one who was accustomed to regard it as his favorite and final authority. At the same time his exegesis was fanciful, unscientific, and often absurd. This fact is abundantly illustrated. The natural sense of Scripture was generally of the least importance to Clement. He did not really understand the biblical writers. He had no fixed principles of hermeneutics. He was bent on allegorizing everything. Just because it was divine Scripture, therefore the Bible had a mystic sense. Sometimes, indeed, when refuting heretics, he did appeal to the plain teaching of Scripture; but, as an interpreter, Clement illustrates nearly all the faults of which an exegete can be guilty. In making his quotations, also, he depended mainly upon memory, so that they are often inaccurate or mixed, and sometimes erroneous. All this, however, while careless according to our modern methods, was common among the Fathers, and shows, as Kutter points out, that Scripture filled Clement's mind and was the main reservoir

from which his thought flowed. Even the very words of Scripture were felt to be of high significance. Whatever opinion Clement held about this or that book, the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments were his sources of authority; and, we may add, in this Clement obviously reveals the opinion of the second-century church.

What books, then, constituted Clement's New Testament? Kutter replies, with all critics, first of all the four canonical gospels. Nor did he add any others to these. He treats a few extracanonical sayings of Christ's (*agrapha*) as possibly genuine, but did not conceive of them as forming a gospel. He cites twice the gospel according to the Hebrews, but after Plato and the "Traditions of Matthew," and merely to illustrate his argument. The gospel according to the Egyptians he cites only because the heretics appealed to certain passages in it, their interpretation of which he contests. While seeming to speak of it as canonical, this was only, says Kutter, by way of concession for the sake of his argument (pp. 51-7). Probably he had never even seen the book. So the Traditions of Matthew (the gospel of Matthias?) was only known to him by hearsay, and his use of the gospel of Philip, the protevangelion of James, and the Ebionite gospel, though thought possible by Zahn, is really quite doubtful. No other gospels than the four canonical ones were recognized by Clement.

Turning next to other ecclesiastical literature, Kutter finds that, while Clement of Rome is often cited, and is called an apostle, and while the epistle of Barnabas is cited and its author called an apostle and identified with the companion of Paul, yet neither is rated as on a par with the New Testament writings. From both of them Clement feels at liberty to differ. Twice (*Strom.*, II, 20, v. 11), indeed, he seems to appeal to Barnabas as a dogmatic authority, but even then his manner of quotation is unlike that used when appealing to Paul. Neither does he, as Harnack alleges, really call Barnabas *γραφή* (p. 79). Clement was fond of the *Shepherd* of Hermas and regarded its visions as real revelations; but he did not class the book itself as authoritative, though his high regard for it led him sometimes to cite it quite like Scripture, yet always with a difference. He certainly used the "Didache," but Kutter questions if he meant to call it Scripture (*Strom.*, I, 20). He may have applied the term to the teaching given in the Didache. The Preaching and the apocalypse of Peter were, however, accepted by him as Petrine and authoritative; and on this point he seems to have differed from the Alexandrian church, as the witness of Origen shows. Of the catholic epistles he recognized as

canonical 1 Peter, 1 John, and Jude, probably 2 John, and possibly James; 2 Peter and 3 John are not referred to. The Acts is cited as of the highest authority, though Kutter, without sufficient reason, thinks that Clement did not give it equal sanctity with the gospels and epistles. The apocalypse of John is called, by preëminence, simply "the Apocalypse," and attributed to the apostle. In short, of our New Testament only Philemon, 2 Peter, and 3 John remain without some attestation by Clement, and most of the books are quoted abundantly, and as dogmatic authorities; while, of later literature, only the Didache, the Preaching and apocalypse of Peter seem to be classed with them, and they are cited but twelve times against 976 citations of the others.

Kutter finally inquires on what principle Clement distinguished Scripture from other ecclesiastical literature. Dausch errs, he says, in alleging that Clement made church tradition of equal authority with Scripture. On the other hand, it was not Scripture *per se* which was Clement's authority, for he used the term itself loosely. His real authority was the Lord speaking in Scripture. The Scriptures were to him the record of a progressive revelation which constituted "the tradition of the Lord." On it was ecclesiastical tradition based; but the latter, while giving fundamental truth, is not the ultimate authority, and "the tradition of the Lord" is best understood through the interpretation of Scripture obtained by the "true gnostic." To the Scripture, thus interpreted, Clement finally appeals. His tests of a book's authority are two: (1) the tradition of the church; (2) the fact that the book contains the teaching of Christ and his apostles. For the teaching of the apostles was the teaching of Christ, and the apostolic age closed the delivery of his doctrine. In conceiving of the apostolic age, however, Clement was uncritical. He made it close with Paul, yet accounted the Johannine books as belonging to it. But apostolicity was his test of canonicity, and his Bible consisted of "law, prophets, gospels, and apostles." At the same time, Kutter thinks that Clement did *not* know of a definite *collection* of books called "the New Testament," though, as appears from what has been said, the elements of such a conception lay close to hand.

Our space has forbidden us to do more than recite the important results obtained by our author. The statement of these is doubtless the most helpful way of calling attention to the work. Its great merit is its effort not to rest content with Clement's formal statements, but to penetrate behind these to his real attitude of mind toward the New Testament. So far as its results go, it brings Clement much nearer to

the traditional doctrine of Scripture than has been done by many other critics. We believe that Kutter might have gone even farther ; for Clement seems to us practically to have had a *collection* of books called " dominical Scriptures " or " New Testament," and to have conceived of Scripture itself as inspired. We have found this monograph, however, very suggestive, and his discussions able and unbiased.

GEORGE T. PURVES.

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

DIE GRIECHISCHEN CHRISTLICHEN SCHRIFTSTELLER DER ERSTEN DREI JAHRHUNDERTE, herausgegeben von der Kirchenväter-Commission der königl. Preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften. *Hippolytus' Werke*, I. Band: Exegetische und homiletische Schriften. Herausg. von G. NATH. BONWETSCH und HANS ACHELIS. I. Hälfte: Die Commentare zu Daniel und zum Hohenliede. II. Hälfte: Kleinere exegetische und homiletische Schriften. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1897. Pp. xxvii + 374; x + 309. M. 18.

IN the year 1866 the Vienna Academy of Sciences began the *corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum*, of which, under the general supervision of Carl Schenkl, some thirty-five volumes have thus far appeared. A worthy companion of this series will be the edition of the Greek Fathers of the first three centuries, published under the auspices of the Royal Academy at Berlin. In 1891 the academy appointed a "church father commission," consisting of Diels, Dillmann, von Gebhardt, Harnack, Loofs, and Mommsen. This commission decided to publish the Christian Greek literature of the first three centuries, including the heretical and apocryphal works and the Jewish literature revised and worked over by Christians. Where original sources were lost, recourse was to be taken to early translations. The introductions and the translation were to be in German. Fifty volumes, each of from 500-600 pages, at a price, approximately, of M. 25 each, have thus far been planned, the whole to be published within fifteen to twenty years. Financially the enterprise is assured by the liberal endowment of Hermann and Elise (*née* Heckmann) Wentzel. Harnack, who probably gave the first impetus, undertook to pave the way for the individual editors by furnishing in his famous *History of Early Christian Literature* a critical survey of the material in hand, and a guide for the history of tradition of the early literature, as far as could be done within three years.